5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Northern District of California

Oakland Division

A&B HOMES, LLC,

No. C 11-00406 CRB (LB)

Plaintiff, v.

NOTICE OF REFERRAL AND ORDER RE DISCOVERY PROCEDURES

REO BAY AREA, LP, et al.,

Defendants.

[ECF No. 8]

TO ALL PARTIES AND COUNSEL OF RECORD:

The district court has referred all discovery in the above-captioned matter to United States Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler. ECF No. 10. On March 1, 2011, Plaintiff A&B Homes, LLC filed a notice requesting an order directing defendants to produce the original note without alterations for "Lot 90 as shown on the Map of Subdivision 8609, filed on August 20, 2003, Map Book 455, at page 48, Contra Costa County Records." ECF No. 8 at 2. A&B Homes, LLC filed the notice pro se. *Id.* at 1.

The court preliminarily observes that a corporation may appear in federal court only through licensed counsel. *See Rowland v. California Men's Colony*, 506 U.S. 202, 201-02 (1993); *United States v. High Country Broadcasting Co., Inc.*, 3 F.3d 1244, 1245 (9th Cir. 1993); N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 3-9(b) ("A corporation, unincorporated association, partnership or other such entity may appear

NOTICE OF REFERRAL AND ORDER C 11-00406 CRB (LB)

¹ Citations are to the clerk's electronic case file (ECF) with pin cites to the electronic page numbers at the top (as opposed to the bottom) of the page.

Case 3:11-cv-00406-CRB Document 11 Filed 03/21/11 Page 2 of 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

only through a member of this court."). Also, and in any event, this court's standing order (attached)
requires certain procedures for addressing discovery disputes. Those procedures require, among
other things, that if a meet-and-confer by other means does not resolve the parties' dispute, lead
counsel for the parties must meet and confer in person. If that procedure does not resolve the
disagreement, the parties must file a joint letter instead of a formal motion. After reviewing the joint
letter, the court will evaluate whether further proceedings are necessary, including any further
briefing or argument.

Accordingly, the pending discovery motion is not properly before the undersigned. The court therefore **DENIES** the pending discovery motion without prejudice.

This disposes of ECF No. 8.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 21, 2011

LAUREL BEELER

United States Magistrate Judge